

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of: Parmeshwar GOBIN <i>et al.</i>	Confirmation No.: 3054
Application No.: 10/822,509	Group Art Unit: 3687
Filed: April 12, 2004	Examiner: Ade, Oger Garcia
Attorney Docket No.: COS97104C1	

For: WEB BASED INTEGRATED CUSTOMER INTERFACE FOR INVOICE
REPORTING

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal dated April 28, 2010.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of the present application, solely for purposes of identifying and avoiding potential conflicts of interest by board members due to working in matters in which the member has a financial interest, is Verizon Communications Inc. and its subsidiary companies, which currently include Verizon Business Global, LLC (formerly MCI, LLC) and Cellco Partnership (doing business as Verizon Wireless, and which includes as a minority partner affiliates of Vodafone Group Plc). Verizon Communications Inc. or one of its subsidiary companies is an assignee of record of the present application.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 21-39 are pending in this appeal, in which claims 1-20 were previously canceled and claim 40 stands withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 121. No claim is allowed. This appeal is therefore taken from the final rejection of claims 21-39 on December 9, 2009.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The amendment to claim 36 filed January 26, 2010 has been entered.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed invention addresses problems associated with an Internet-based invoice viewing service. In particular, the claimed invention provides for connectivity between legacy systems and enterprise application servers for providing customer connectivity over the public Internet, obviating a need to cater programs to specific native vendor-supplied listener programs. A client browser application provides a common GUI enabling both report requesting, customizing and viewing various types of data from different server applications in a single user session.

Also, the claimed invention provides for dynamic accumulator functionality, allowing customers to sum up numerical figures, such as minutes and charges, by highlighting the numbers directly on the screen displaying the document.

Independent claim 21 recites:

21. An integrated invoicing system comprising:

a plurality of interfaces configured to communicate with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data (See, e.g., Specification, page 10, lines 21-24, page 13, line 19, page 17, line 14, page 33, lines 10-14, page 27, lines 11-18, page 31, lines 4-13, page 35, lines 11-18, page 46, Table 2; Figs. 3 and 4, browser 14; Fig. 3, GUI 56(a));

a conversion module configured to compress the invoice data for storage in a database and to create key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database (See, e.g., Specification, page 43, line 2-page 45, line 9, page 45, line 30-page 46, line 9; Fig. 11, conversion module 1036; databases 1059, 1067; compressed data created at 1046); and

an invoice processing module configured to receive a request message from a host for an invoice document to access the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message and to generate a response message containing the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data (See, e.g., Specification, page 6, lines 10-16), the response message being forward to the host for display of the invoice document via a downloadable program (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, line 16-page 5, line 22, page 33, lines 23-31; Figs. 8, 9, 13, 15).

Dependent claim 24 recites:

24. A system according to claim 21, wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, lines 16-24, page 41, lines 7-32; Fig. 14).

Independent claim 26 recites:

26. A computer-implemented method for providing on-line invoice access, the method comprising:

communicating with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data (See, e.g., Specification, page 10, lines 21-24, page 13, line 19, page 17, line 14, page 33, lines 10-14, page 27, lines 11-18, page 31, lines 4-13, page 35, lines 11-18, page 46, Table 2; Figs. 3 and 4, browser 14; Fig. 3, GUI 56(a));

converting, in a processor, the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database (See, e.g., Specification, page 43, line 2-page 45, line 9, page 45, line 30-page 46, line 9; Fig. 11, conversion module 1036; databases 1059, 1067; compressed data created at 1046);

receiving a request message from a host for an invoice document (See, e.g., Specification, page 6, lines 10-16);

accessing the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message (See, e.g., Specification, page 6, lines 10-16; Fig. 11, databases 1059, 1067);

generating a response message containing the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data (See, e.g., Specification, page 6, lines 10-16); and

forwarding the response message to the host for display of the invoice document via a downloadable program (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, line 16-page 5, line 22, page 33, lines 23-31; Figs. 8, 9, 13, 15).

Dependent claim 29 recites:

29. A method according to claim 26, wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, lines 16-24, page 41, lines 7-32; Fig. 14).

Independent claim 31 recites:

31. A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of one or more instructions for providing on-line invoice access, the one or more sequences of one or more instructions including instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to perform the steps of:

communicating with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data (See, e.g., Specification, page 10, lines 21-24, page 13, line 19, page 17, line 14, page 33, lines 10-14, page 27, lines 11-18, page 31, lines 4-13, page 35, lines 11-18, page 46, Table 2; Figs. 3 and 4, browser 14; Fig. 3, GUI 56(a));

converting the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database (See, e.g., Specification, page 43, line 2-page 45, line 9, page 45, line 30-page

46, line 9; Fig. 11, conversion module 1036; databases 1059, 1067; compressed data created at 1046);

receiving a request message from a host for an invoice document (See, e.g., Specification, page 6, lines 10-16);

accessing the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message (See, e.g., Specification, page 6, lines 10-16; Fig. 11, databases 1059, 1067);

generating a response message containing the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data (See, e.g., Specification, page 6, lines 10-16); and

forwarding the response message to the host for display of the invoice document via a downloadable program (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, line 16-page 5, line 22, page 33, lines 23-31; Figs. 8, 9, 13, 15).

Dependent claim 34 recites:

34. A computer-readable medium according to claim 31, wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, lines 16-24, page 41, lines 7-32; Fig. 14).

Independent claim 36 recites:

36. A method for accessing telecommunication invoices, the method comprising:

transmitting a request message for an invoice document to an invoice system, wherein the invoice system communicates with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data,

the invoice system comprising a processor for converting the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database, the invoice system accessing the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message to generate a response message containing an image of the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data; and selectively downloading a presentation program for display of the image of the invoice document.

Dependent claim 39 recites:

39. A method according to claim 36, further comprising:

highlighting figures on the image of the invoice document (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, lines 16-24, page 7, lines 27-29, page 39, lines 4-16, page 41, lines 7-32; Fig. 8, item 814, Fig. 15); and

performing an arithmetic operation of the highlighted figures (See, e.g., Specification, page 4, lines 16-24, page 41, lines 7-32; Fig. 14).

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 26-30 and 36-39 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claims 21-39 were rejected for anticipation under 35 U.S.C §102(e) based on *Barry et al.* (US 6,615,258).

VII. ARGUMENT

A. **CLAIMS 26-30 AND 36-39 ARE DIRECTED TO STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER BECAUSE THE CLAIMED PROCESSOR AND DATABASE ARE CLEARLY MACHINES WITHIN THE MEANING OF 35 U.S.C. §101.**

Independent claim 26 recites, *inter alia*, “converting...the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within **the database**” performed “in a **processor**.” Similarly, independent claim 36 recites, *inter alia*, “the invoice system... converting the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for **storage in a database** and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database, the invoice system **accessing the database** for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message to generate a response message containing an image of the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data” comprises a **processor**.

Clearly, a database and a processor each constitute a “machine or apparatus,” causing the instant claimed subject matter to fit squarely within the categories of subject matter available for patent under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The Examiner has never addressed the recitation of a “processor” within the claims nor pointed out why the recitation of physical elements such as a “**database**” and a “**processor**” is not enough to keep the claimed subject matter within the realm of patentable subject matter defined in 35 U.S.C. §101.

In the Advisory Action of April 13, 2010, the Examiner asserted, *in toto*:

Examiner determines that the claim constitutes insignificant extra-solution activity because the step(s) constitute mere data transmission or recordation. Accordingly, claim 26 remains unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the insignificant extra-solution steps, for example: “generating a response message containing the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data; and

forwarding the response message to the host for display for the invoice document via a downloadable program..., and etc.” are incapable of imparting parent-eligibility under § 101. (For further guidance see also the USPTO Memorandum “Guidance for examining Process Claims in view of *In re Bilski*” dated 7 January 2009).[sic].

Clearly, computer **processors** and **databases** are statutory “machines” and methods employing such physical elements to perform the claimed method pass muster under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The claimed methods are tied to another statutory class, *viz.*, a machine (processor, database). Moreover, the claimed methods clearly transform underlying subject matter (a request for invoice data) to a different state or thing (a display of invoice data). Accordingly, independent method claims 26 and 36 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §101.

To the extent that the Examiner is focusing on the “downloadable program” aspect of independent claims 26 and 36, the program relates to software used in the performance of the claimed methods. Appellants note that there is no controlling authority holding that a program, or “software per se,” is unpatentable. *In re Bilski*, 544 F.3d 943, 88USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008) mentions software but only in footnote 25, suggesting that a machine-or-transformation test for patentability of a process under 35 U.S.C. §101 likewise applies to software performing that process. In any event, the “downloadable program” recited in claim 26, and recited in a different manner in claim 36, is but merely a part of the claimed “computer-implemented method” (claim 26) and “method for accessing telecommunication invoices” (claim 36). Employing software, or a downloadable program, within a method is not precluded under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 26-30 and 36-39 clearly pass muster under 35 U.S.C. §101.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner alludes to *In re Bilski*, 544 F.3d 943, 88USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en banc). However, the claim analyzed by the court in that case recited a

“method for managing the consumption risk costs of a commodity sold by a commodity provider at a fixed price comprising” various steps. It is noteworthy that that claim, unlike the ones before the Honorable Board in the instant case, was not restricted to any apparatus or machine (*viz.*, a “processor” and a “database”) for implementing the recited method. Appellants’ claims 26-30 are restricted to a “**computer**-implemented method.” Claims 36-39 are restricted to a “method for managing the consumption risk costs of a commodity sold by a commodity provider at a fixed price comprising” a processor and a database. Claims directed to computers are statutory within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, in that they are, indeed, **machines**. A computer is employed to automatically perform a series of steps, or algorithms, to implement certain processes in accordance with a program or set of instructions but it is a “machine” nonetheless that performs the functions implementing the claimed method, i.e., a “**computer-implemented** method.”

Moreover, unlike the claims of concern in *Bilski*, the instant claims before the Honorable Board are not directed to a mere “business method” of “initiating a series of transactions between said commodity provider and consumers of said commodity wherein said consumers purchase said commodity at a fixed rate ...,” “identifying market participants,” and “initiating a series of transactions between said commodity provider and said market participants at a second fixed rate....” Rather, the instant claims actually transform a request for invoice data into an actual delivery of that data as a display.

The manner of embodiment of certain claimed elements should not control the statutory nature of the claimed subject matter. Whether embodied as hardware or software, a machine, i.e., a computer, performs the claimed method steps of converting, **in a processor**, the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in **a database** and **creating key information** for retrieving the compressed invoice data **within the database**, accessing the

database...and forwarding the response message to the host for display of the invoice document via a downloadable program, is unequivocally a statutory “process” within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101. In any event, Appellants are aware of no precedent holding that the employment of software, or downloadable program, will, *per se*, classify an invention as non-statutory. In fact, in *dicta* in *Gottschalk v Benson*, 409 U.S. 63 (1972), the Supreme Court stated, “It is said that the decision precludes a patent for any program servicing a computer. **We do not so hold.**”

Appellants also disagree with the Examiner’s assertion that the claimed steps of “generating a response message...” and “forwarding the response message to the host for display for the invoice document via a downloadable program” constitute mere “insignificant extra-solution steps.” The response message that is generated contains “the invoice document.” That invoice document is then displayed “providing on-line invoice access” to a user. The display of the invoice document is more than an “insignificant extra-solution step” as one goal of the invention is to permit a user to access the invoice document over the public Internet, obviating a need to cater programs to specific native vendor-supplied listener programs. This is provided by converting, in a processor, retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database. Then, when a request message from a host for an invoice document is received, the database is accessed in order to retrieve invoice data corresponding to the invoice document. A response message containing the invoice document is then generated, and the response message is forwarded to the host for display of the invoice document via a downloadable program.

Thus, independent claims 26 and 36 both pass muster under both the transformation test and the machine test of *Bilski*. The claims meet the transformation test because there is a transformation of a request for invoice data into a physical display of an actual invoice document,

which did not exist before the claimed method provided the document. The claims meet the “machine” test because the methods are carried out using a “processor” and a “database,” both physical elements, or “machines,” within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101.

Accordingly, the Honorable Board’s reversal of the Examiner’s rejection of claims 26-30 and 36-39 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully solicited.

B. CLAIMS 21-39 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY *BARRY ET AL.* BECAUSE *BARRY ET AL.* FAILS TO DISCLOSE COMPRESSING INVOICE DATA FOR STORAGE IN A DATABASE AND CREATING KEY INFORMATION FOR RETRIEVING THE COMPRESSED INVOICE DATA WITHIN THE DATABASE.

To anticipate a patent claim, every element and limitation of the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim. *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383, 58 USPQ2d 1286, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 USPQ2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

A prior art reference anticipates a patent claims if it discloses every limitation of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997). “Under the principles of inherency, if the prior art necessarily functions in accordance with, or includes, the claimed limitations, it anticipates.” *MEHL/Biophile Int’l Corp. v. Milgraum*, 192 F.3d 1362, 1365, 52 USPQ2d 1303, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, “a conversion module configured to **compress** the invoice data for storage in a database and to **create key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data** within the database.” Independent claims 26 and 31 recite, *inter alia*,

“**converting the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data** for storage in a database and **creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data** within the database.” Independent claim 36 recites, *inter alia*, “the invoice system **converting** the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and **creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data** within the database.”

Barry et al. does not disclose these features. Instead, *Barry et al.* performs a conversion process and stores converted data on tape. There is no disclosure of “**compressing** the invoice data for storage in a database” or “**creating key information** for retrieving the compressed invoice data.” Accordingly, *Barry et al.* cannot anticipate the instant claimed subject matter.

At pages 10-11 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserted that *Barry et al.* “discloses a Web-based, integrated customer interface system for data management,” and that the reference discloses data management products and services include “1) report requestor, report viewer, and report management applications enabling a customer to request, specify, customize, and schedule delivery of reports...2) centralized inbox system for providing on-line reporting, presentation, and notifications...3) an operational data storage system...4) a trouble ticket tool enabling a customer to open and monitor trouble tickets...5) a Web-based invoice reporting system allowing the customers access to their billing and invoice reports...6) an Internet “online” order entry and administration service to enable customers to manage their accounts; and 7) a system for handling security and authentication requests from both client and server side of the applications....”

Further, at page 11 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserted, with regard to calculations performed on figures selected from an invoice document, the Report Manager 250 of *Barry et al.* includes and provides access to metadata used to tell the Report Requestor what a

standard report should look like and what options are available to the user. Moreover, at page 11 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserted, responsive to Appellants' argument regarding no teaching by *Barry et al.* of highlighting figures on an image of an invoice document and performing arithmetic operations on those highlighted figures, the report viewer application 215 of *Barry et al.* is able to accept messages instructing it to display an image or text that may be passed by one of the applications in lieu of report data.

Thus, none of the Examiner's arguments in the Final Office Action are responsive to Appellants' assertions that there is no disclosure of “**compressing** the invoice data for storage in a database” or “**creating key information** for retrieving the compressed invoice data” in *Barry et al.* Appellants maintain that *Barry et al.* lacks any teaching of these specific claim features and the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation for at least this reason.

The assertion by the Examiner in the Final Office Action, at page 5, that “the online invoicing server typically performs a conversion process and stores the converted data on tape until an audit approval” is unsubstantiated by any evidence of record regarding what is “typical” in an online invoicing server. Moreover, even if true, which Appellants do not admit, there is still no evidence in *Barry et al.*, nor has the Examiner identified such, regarding “**creating key information** for retrieving the compressed invoice data.”

Accordingly, the Honorable Board's reversal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 21-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully solicited.

Additionally, claims 24, 29, 34, and 39 are patentable separately from the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 24, 29, and 34 recite “wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for **performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures.**” Claim 39 recites “**highlighting** figures on the image of the invoice document; and **performing an arithmetic operation of the highlighted figures.**” These features are not disclosed in *Barry et al.*

At page 7 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner referred to “figure 56” (presumably, Fig. 17 was intended) and online invoicing server 1350 storing documents from different billing systems and performing various database queries and function calls in response to requests received from the customer via the online invoicing proxy 1340, as disclosing the feature of “**wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures.**” In particular, the Examiner asserted, “the online invoicing server 1350 is responsible for tasks including data collection, calculation, storage and report generation.” Although, the portion of *Barry et al.* relied on is not cited, it is presumed that the Examiner is referencing col. 44, lines 64-67.

The disclosure of *Barry et al.* is merely that online invoicing server 1350 is responsible for tasks that include “calculation.” It is noted, again, that while the Examiner, and *Barry et al.*, at col. 44, line 67, refer to Fig. “56,” The figures described in the reference only extend to Fig. 27(b). There is no Fig. 56.

In any event, the mere disclosure of some generic “calculation” by an online invoice server in *Barry et al.* is clearly not a disclosure of “wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures.” *Barry et al.*, in no way, suggests that any calculation is **performed on figures selected from the invoice document**, as claimed. The Examiner’s reference to Report Manager 250, at

page 11 of the Final Office Action, as providing access to metadata used to tell the Report Requestor what a standard report should look like and what options are available to the user, does not cure this deficiency in *Barry et al.* because Report Manager 250, while providing access to metadata, does not provide for “selecting figures presented in the invoice document **for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures**,” as claimed.

Further, this cited portion of the reference clearly suggests nothing relative to **highlighting figures** on an image of an invoice document and performing an **arithmetic operation on those highlighted figures**. At page 11 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserted that highlighting figures on an image of an invoice document and performing arithmetic operations on those highlighted figures, is suggested by the report viewer application 215 of *Barry et al.*, which is able to accept messages instructing it to display an image or text that may be passed by one of the applications in lieu of report data. The mere display of a message or text does not correspond to “**highlighting figures on the image of the invoice document**,” as recited, for example, by claim 39.

Accordingly, since *Barry et al.* lacks any teaching of the above-argued features, it cannot and does not anticipate the subject matter of the instant claims. Therefore, the Honorable Board is respectfully solicited to reverse the Examiner’s rejection of claims 21-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

VIII. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF

For the foregoing reasons, Appellants request the Honorable Board to reverse each of the Examiner's rejections.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

May 28, 2010
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

Errol A. Krass
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 60090

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9952
Fax (703) 519-9958

IX. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. – 20. (Canceled)

21. An integrated invoicing system comprising:

a plurality of interfaces configured to communicate with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data;

a conversion module configured to compress the invoice data for storage in a database and to create key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database; and

an invoice processing module configured to receive a request message from a host for an invoice document, to access the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message, and to generate a response message containing the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data, the response message being forward to the host for display of the invoice document via a downloadable program.

22. A system according to claim 21, wherein the host receives the response message via a web browser, the downloadable program being executed within the web browser.

23. A system according to claim 21, wherein the downloadable program is platform independent with respect to the host.

24. A system according to claim 21, wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures.

25. A system according to claim 21, wherein the host populates a products and date range field associated with a user identifier, the products and date range field listing application services and time periods for which the invoice document is available for presentation.

26. A computer-implemented method for providing on-line invoice access, the method comprising:

communicating with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data;

converting, in a processor, the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database;

receiving a request message from a host for an invoice document;

accessing the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message;

generating a response message containing the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data; and

forwarding the response message to the host for display of the invoice document via a downloadable program.

27. A method according to claim 26, wherein the host receives the response message via a web browser, the downloadable program being executed within the web browser.

28. A method according to claim 26, wherein the downloadable program is platform independent with respect to the host.

29. A method according to claim 26, wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures.

30. A method according to claim 26, wherein the host populates a products and date range field associated with a user identifier, the products and date range field listing application services and time periods for which the invoice document is available for presentation.

31. A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of one or more instructions for providing on-line invoice access, the one or more sequences of one or more instructions including instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to perform the steps of:

communicating with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data;

converting the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database

and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database;

receiving a request message from a host for an invoice document;

accessing the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in

response to the request message;

generating a response message containing the invoice document based on the retrieved

invoice data; and

forwarding the response message to the host for display of the invoice document via a

downloadable program.

32. A computer-readable medium according to claim 31, wherein the host receives the response message via a web browser, the downloadable program being executed within the web browser.

33. A computer-readable medium according to claim 31, wherein the downloadable program is platform independent with respect to the host.

34. A computer-readable medium according to claim 31, wherein the host supports selecting figures presented in the invoice document for performing an arithmetic operation on the selected figures.

35. A computer-readable medium according to claim 31, wherein the host populates a products and date range field associated with a user identifier, the products and date range field listing application services and time periods for which the invoice document is available for presentation.

36. A method for accessing telecommunication invoices, the method comprising:

transmitting a request message for an invoice document to an invoice system, wherein the invoice system communicates with a plurality of billing systems to retrieve invoice data, the invoice system comprising a processor for converting the retrieved invoice data by compressing the invoice data for storage in a database and creating key information for retrieving the compressed invoice data within the database, the invoice system accessing the database for retrieval of invoice data corresponding to the invoice document in response to the request message to generate a response message containing an image of the invoice document based on the retrieved invoice data; and selectively downloading a presentation program for display of the image of the invoice document.

37. A method according to claim 36, further comprising:

receiving the response message over a secure communication session of a packet switched network.

38. A method according to claim 36, wherein the downloadable program is platform independent.

39. A method according to claim 36, further comprising:

highlighting figures on the image of the invoice document; and
performing an arithmetic operation of the highlighted figures.

40. (Withdrawn) A method for supporting on-line invoicing and providing user access of electronic invoices for telecommunication services, the method comprising:

collect billing information from a plurality of billing systems associated with the telecommunication services for storage in a centralized database;
storing a presentation program that is downloadable for viewing an invoice document associated with the collected billing information by a browser application, wherein the browser application transmits a request message for information of the invoice document;
accessing the database to generate a response message containing the billing information corresponding to the invoice document, the response message being transmitted to the browser application; and
selectively forwarding the presentation program to the browser application for display of the invoice document.

X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

Appellants are unaware of any evidence that is required to be submitted in the present Evidence Appendix.

XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Appellants are unaware of any related proceedings that are required to be submitted in the present Related Proceedings Appendix.